

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-16, 19 and 20 are pending in the application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claim 18 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to clarify the method steps being claimed. For example, Claim 19 claims, inter alia, "providing within said Protocol Data Unit an identifier field for identifying different functionally based supplementary services" and Claim 20 claims, "formatting said message according to H.323; and encoding said Protocol Data Unit using Alpha Numeric String Encoding and transmitted within a non-standard data field of H.323 messages."

The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, wherein the Examiner stated essentially that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 18 has been cancelled. Claims 1-16 and 19-20 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter, and more particularly, claims 1-16 are directed "a terminal for communicating over a computer-network using a message, wherein the terminal encodes the message" and claims 19 and 20 are directed to "a computer-implemented method of encoding a Protocol Data Unit." Such subject matter is believed to be statutory subject matter, for example, a terminal for communicating over a computer-network as claimed in claims 1-16 is a machine

and the computer-implemented method of claims 19 and 20 is a process having a useful, concrete and tangible result, e.g., network communication. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Korpi (U.S. Patent No. 6,621,814). The Examiner stated essentially that the teachings of Korpi teach or suggest all the limitations recited in claims 1-16 and 18-20.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, “a Protocol Data Unit encoded in accordance with a Simple Supplementary Services Protocol (SSSP) and carried via said message, wherein said message is formatted for network communications, the Protocol Data Unit comprising, an identifier field for identifying different functionally based supplementary services, an identifier field for denoting message endings, and a parameters extensions field separating said identified field and said end tag field.” Claim 19 claims, *inter alia*, “transmitting said Protocol Data Unit via a message formatted for network communications comprising: providing within said Protocol Data Unit an identifier field for identifying different functionally based supplementary services; providing within said Protocol Data Unit an end tag field for denoting message endings; and providing within said Protocol Data Unit a parameters extensions field separating said identifier field and said end tag field.”

As noted in the Final Office Action, Korpi was silent about the specifics of the PDUs encoding including identifier fields identifying functionally different supplementary service, the use of alphanumeric string encoding, the use of a comma and/or an asterisk as a ParameterSeparator, a protocol tag, and the limited size of the characters used to describe multiple data fields. Indeed, Korpi fails to teach or suggest “an identifier field for identifying different functionally based supplementary services, an identifier field for denoting message

endings, and a parameters extensions field separating said identified field and said end tag field” as claimed in claim 1 or “providing within said Protocol Data Unit an identifier field for identifying different functionally based supplementary services; providing within said Protocol Data Unit an end tag field for denoting message endings; and providing within said Protocol Data Unit a parameters extensions field separating said identifier field and said end tag field” as claimed in claim 19.


Further, Applicants note that obviousness is only satisfied by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references (emphasis added). The Final Office Action points only to the supposed “arbitrary choices” claimed in the present application. Even assuming *arguendo* that the claimed limitations are “arbitrary,” such a finding would not cure the deficiencies of Korpi. That is, Korpi fails to include some objection teaching directed towards any format of a message or a PDU, much less those particularly claimed in claims 1 and 19. Korpi fails to include such an objective teaching or suggestion of, among other limitations, “an identifier field for identifying different functionally based supplementary services” as claimed in claim 1 or “providing within said Protocol Data Unit an identifier field for identifying different functionally based supplementary services” as claimed in claim 19. Under such circumstances the Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-16 depend from claim 1. Claim 20 depends from claim 19. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 19. Claim 18 has been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1-16, 19 and 20, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:  
**F. Chau & Associates, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889